

The book would have been strengthened with a modest follow-up. The authors could have cited recent polls on the subject or preliminary birth rate figures from the 1980 census. They might also have sketched out the birth control measures undertaken by the government since 1974. As it stands, the book does not deal with politics at all.

University of New Mexico

MICHAEL L. CONNIFF

Capitalist Control and Workers' Struggle in the Brazilian Auto Industry. By JOHN HUMPHREY. (n.p.). Tables. Notes. Illustrations. Bibliography. Index. Pp. xvii, 258. Cloth. \$22.50.

Brazil's automobile industry, which set the pace for manufacturing growth since the late 1950s, faced major problems in the 1970s. The oil crisis raised costs to both producers and consumers, stalling expansion. Then a series of auto worker strikes that began in 1978 threatened to disrupt the prevailing labor relations system. Political observers linked the strikes to the redemocratization process and wrote about the "new unionism."

John Humphrey had studied labor relations in the auto sector in the mid-1970s, testing the notion that the workers were an elite. He found that although auto workers earned more, they suffered many disadvantages, such as job instability and strict discipline. He dismissed the labor elite theory. Then he returned several years later to look into the strikes. He described the way in which union leaders organized the men and conducted negotiations with management. Familiar with the problems of the industry, he was not surprised to see the shutdowns. He drew larger implications from the strikes, however: now that the old system of government mediation had been discredited, labor and management would have to decide whether to pursue a more political kind of bargaining or to adopt United States-style business unionism. The outcome was still unclear when Humphrey wrote.

This book fits nicely into the revisionist labor studies coming out of Brazil today. Well-researched and cautiously written, it should be a standard source on the auto industry for some time to come.

University of New Mexico

MICHAEL L. CONNIFF

U.S.—Panama Relations, 1903—1978: A Study in Linkage Politics. By DAVID N. FARNSWORTH and JAMES W. MCKENNEY. Boulder: Westview Press, 1983. Notes. Appendixes. Bibliography. Index. Pp. ix, 313. Paper. \$23.00.

The 1977 Panama Canal Treaty deserves a careful monograph, but until one comes along this work will have to suffice. The authors of this book recorded the multitude of steps that led to the Treaty. In so doing, they chronicled its official as well as unofficial diplomacy from the 1964 riots until its implementation by the Panama Canal Act of 1979. Most of the information comes from the *New York Times*, *Foreign Broadcast Information Service*, congressional publications, and the secondary literature in English. No Panamanian authors are listed in the bibliography, nor are interviews cited in the footnotes. As might be anticipated, events and attitudes in the United States receive much fuller attention than those in Panama. Still, the facts may be trusted for the period after 1964, and the book is useful for its narrative of United States—Panamanian relations in the late 1960s and 1970s.

The authors did not achieve their other aim, however, which was to analyze United States—Panamanian relations since 1903 in the light of linkage theory. First, the pre-1964 material is neither complete nor factually trustworthy. Second, linkage theory is not an integral and continuing part of the text; instead, it seems imposed, almost as an afterthought. As

it is presented here, linkage theory holds that domestic politics may influence relations between two countries as much as official diplomacy and hence must be taken into account. All the negotiations, contacts, pressures, influences, and coercive measures make up linkages. This theory will hardly surprise diplomatic historians, and the occasional references to it in chapter introductions and conclusions distract more than they enlighten. In the final chapter, linkages get fewer than two pages. Unfortunately, this superficial framework elbows out real analysis and interpretation.

Finally, the potential reader deserves a warning about careless writing and editing. Grammatical and spelling errors irritate, especially in Spanish. Some material is repeated verbatim. The chapter organization causes the authors to jump around in time. Westview's Replica editions are supposed to make available good books that require production savings to compensate for small audiences. In this case they have given us a cut-rate book.

University of New Mexico

MICHAEL L. CONNIFF